



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/923,612	09/04/1997	SETHURAMAN SURESH	SF/0014.01	2793
22470	7590	09/01/2006		
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			EXAMINER CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
08/923,612	SURESH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Srirama Channavajjala	2166	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 1997 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/04; 4/6/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2166

DETAILED ACTION

Response to RCE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/10/2004 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-25,27-30 are pending in this application.
3. Claim 26 has been cancelled.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Applicant is hereby required to submit "abstract" on a separate sheet within the **"range of 50 to 150 words"** in response to this office action.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the **range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The

Art Unit: 2166

abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 09/04/1997 are approved for examination purposes.

Priority

6. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged based on the provisional application **60/043,593** filed on 4/15/1997.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement filed on 2/10/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with this Office Action, however, on page 7/15, "PTO-1449" is not considered because it is "not prior art"

8. The information disclosure statement filed on 4/6/2004 is not considered because references C2 through C26 [3 pages] are not received. Applicant is hereby required to provide "references C2 through C26 " in response to this office action.

Art Unit: 2166

9. Applicant filed "Information disclosure statement" on 2/6/1999 and 8/26/1999 are exactly the same [duplicate], however, examiner notes that in the IDS filed on 8/26/1999, US Patent No. "**5,694,990**" should be US Patent "**5,684,990**" [typographical error]. Further, PTO-1449 filed on 2/6/1999 was considered and mailed with the previous office action.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2166

11. Claims 1-25,27-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39, of US Patent No. **6,275,831**; claims 1-18 of US Patent No. **6,915,312**; claims 1-30 of US Patent No. **6,295,541**, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: in the present instant application Independent Claim 1 directed to "In a system providing one dataset in communication with another dataset, a method for synchronizing datasets comprising: receiving a request specifying **synchronization**.....**source dataset** residing on a **first device** with information records of a **target dataset** residing on a **second device**; determining a synchronization set by: (i) determining.....(ii) determining which, if any, information....added to or modified at the source dataset.....target dataset, wherein each information record of the source dataset is assigned a **globally unique identifier** that is independent of either of the devices.... Based on said synchronization set, synchronizing information records of the source dataset.....(i) using said **globally unique identifiers**,source dataset, and (ii) using said **globally unique identifiers**, updating the target dataset.....last synchronized with the target dataset",

while US Patent No. **6,275,831**, **claim 1**, limitation "In a data processing....a method for **synchronizing multiple data sets**.....establishing a **data repository** for facilitating **synchronization**....storing at least one mapping....receiving a request for **synchronizing at least one data set**....based on user information.....**changes can be reconciled with**propagated to the data repository, to the extent that such **changes are not present** at said each data set; wherein a particular.....client device is

Art Unit: 2166

actually connected”; **claim 20**, limitation, “A method for providing synchronization.....: creating a reference database.....creating a list of actions to perform.....data records should be added, updated, or deleted at a particular client.....for each client, determining all data records which have been updated, added, or deleted.....based on the data records determined to have been updated, added, or deleted.....for each client, determining all data records.....synchronization the clients by performing instruction....”, **claim 35, limitation “A synchronization system providing synchronization.....a reference database.....a synchronization.....client device and storing instructions specifying that particular data records should be *added, updated, or deleted*.....determining for each client device all data records....determining for each client device all data records which have been updated.....synchronizing the clients by performing.....”**

US Patent No. **6,915,312** claim 1 “In a data processing....**synchronizing multiple data sets**....establishing a **data repository** for facilitating synchronization ofmore than **two data sets**,....storing at least one mapping.....receiving a request for synchronizing at least one data set; based on userbased on userpropagating to said at least one data setat least one data set;

US Patent No. **6,295,541** claim 1,9,10 “In an information.....**multiple datasets residing on different devices**.....accepting a designation ...**multiple datasets comprising more than two datasets from different devices to be**

Art Unit: 2166

synchronized.....designated datasets; in response to said designation, creating a reference dataset.....**uniquely identified** in a manner that is independent of how records are identifieddesignated datasets.....point in time; and in response to thesynchronizing all of the designated datasets without requiring further designating of datasets to be synchronized,.....one record”; claim 30, “ A system for synchronizing more than two designated datasets,means for providing a synchronizer dataset....**globally-unique record identifier** that is independent of how any corresponding records from the designated datasets are identified; means fordesignated datasets; using said synchronizer dataset.....update, or deletion of a record in the each designated dataset.....update, or deletion of a record; and means for updating the synchronizer datasetdeletion of a record”

It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to modify the cited steps as indicated claims 1,21 in the instant US Application since the omission and addition of the cited limitations would have not changed the process or scope according to which the scope of synchronizing datasets, receiving a request specifying **synchronization of records of source dataset from first device and records of target dataset from second device**, further **globally unique identifier** are being maintained that is device independent record map Therefore, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify claims 1,21 of the cited instant US application by substituting the steps of claims 1-39, of US Patent No. **6,275,831**; claims 1-18 of US Patent No. **6,915,312**; claims 1-30 of US Patent No.

Art Unit: 2166

6,295,541, further, the above cited omitting/added elements would not interfere with the functionality of the steps previously claimed and would perform the same function, and present application claim is within the scope of the Claims of the US Patent No. **6,275,831**, **6,915,312**, **6,295,541** . In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963).

The dependent claims 2-20,22-25,27-30 of the instant application are rejected in the analysis above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. **Claims 1-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Crozier US Patent No. 5701423* in view of *Norin et al. [hereafter Norin]*, *US Patent No. 5794253***

14. As to claim 1, Crozier teaches a system which including 'in a system providing one dataset in communication with another dataset, a method for synchronizing datasets' [col 3, line 31-33, fig 1], Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciling or synchronizing databases for example synchronizing data records between handheld

Art Unit: 2166

computer and desktop computer as detailed in fig 1, examiner interpreting datasets are integral part of both handheld and desktop computer because both handheld and desktop computer have records related to for example hone, schedule, to-do memo from handheld computer, and personal information, spreadsheet manager, word processing manager from desktop computer; :

'receiving a request specifying synchronization of information records of a source dataset residing on a first device with information records of a target dataset residing on a second device' [col 3, line 31-37, fig 1], Crozier specifically teaches sharing data, dynamically reconciliation and resolving conflicts between handheld computer and desktop computer as detailed in fig 1, col 3, line 31-37, information records of a source dataset residing on a first device corresponds to Crozier's fig 1, element 101, second device corresponds to fig 1, element 115;

determining a synchronization set by: (i) determining which, if any, information records have been previously transmitted to the target dataset but no longer exists at the source dataset' [col 5, line 9-17, line 39-42], Crozier specifically teaches mapping of the files between handheld, desktop devices, translation of data between both devices, and transfer of data between two devices as detailed in fig 1, furthermore, Crozier also suggests dynamically reconciling the records and resolving the conflicts between handheld and desktop data as detailed in col 5, line 39-42;

(ii) determining which, if any, information records have been added to or modified at the source dataset since the source dataset was last synchronized with the target

Art Unit: 2166

dataset' [col 11, line 62-67, col 12, line 1-8, fig 7], Crozier specifically suggests if the data in any given field is different, update to the field, or edit part or all of the data in the record and write it to the target database as detailed in col 12, line 1-8;

wherein each information record of the source dataset is assigned a unique identifier that is independent of either of the devices, for identifying said each information record at both the source dataset and the target dataset, said unique identifier being maintained in a device-independent record map that allows the unique identifier to be traced back to a specific information record regardless of which device the specific information record resides' [col 8, line 10-38], Crozier specifically teaches mapping between handheld, desktop computer records specifying the both handheld, desktop applications, further, Crozier also suggests handheld database file that specifies "record number", i.e., assigning "unique record id " defining the uniqueness of the record as detailed in col 8, line 10-38; 'based on said synchronization set, synchronizing information records of the source dataset with information records of the target dataset' [col 11, line 32-39], Crozier specifically suggests dynamic reconciliation between handheld computer to the desktop computer that including mapping of record fields between source dataset and target dataset as detailed in col 11, line 32-39]

(i) using said unique identifiers, deleting from the target dataset any information records which have been previously transmitted to the target dataset but no longer exist at the source dataset' [col 9, table 1, line 10-11], Crozier specifically suggests updating the target field table for specified handheld or source field as detailed in col 9, line 10-11;

(ii) using said unique identifiers, updating the target dataset so that said target dataset includes those information records determined to have been added to or modified at the source dataset since the source dataset was last synchronized with the target dataset' [col 11, line 40-48, line 49-61]. It is however, noted that Crozier does not specifically teach "globally unique identifier", although Crozier specifically teaches record number in source dataset and target data set specifies "unique record ID" [see Crozier: col 8, line 22-25]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 64-66].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because both Crozier, and Norin are directed to "synchronizing data sets from source and target, more specifically Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciliation or synchronizing data records between desktop and handheld computer as detailed in fig 1, col 11, 32-39], while Norin also suggests synchronizing and replication of data sets or data objects in a distributing network [see fig 1, col 2, line 44-50, col 8, line 13-26], and both Crozier, Norin specifically teaches "data set or data records is assigned unique ID" [Crozier: col 8, line 22-25; Norin: col 9, line 49-50, line 53-54].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically

Art Unit: 2166

reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because that would have allowed users of Crozier to globally synchronizing clock value as part of the data set ID that identifier uniquely data records across source and target databases, further replication list also containing additional information indicating replication of the data set and a time last modified stamp indicating the time the replica state was last modified as suggested by Norin et al. [col 10, line 22-28] bringing the advantages of highly flexible replication process where time based expiration can be tailored individually for each source and target database [col 6, line 15-16].

15. As to claim 2, Crozier disclosed 'each dataset comprises a database table having a plurality of data records' [fig 2, element 103, element 200,col 6, line 31-34].

16. As to claim 3, Crozier disclosed 'wherein each dataset comprises an electronic address book listing contact information' [fig 3, element 121, col 7, line 18-24].

17. As to claim 4, Crozier disclosed 'wherein each dataset comprises an electronic schedule listing scheduling information' [col 7, line 10-13, fig 1, element 105].

18. As to claim 5, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifiers are created by the system regardless of whether the source dataset includes existing record identifiers' [col 9, line 53-59, line 62-67, col 10, line 1-4].

Art Unit: 2166

19. As to claim 6, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifiers are maintained in a record map stored apart from the source dataset' col 10, line 5-7].

20. As to claim 7, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier for each record comprises a timestamp which is assigned to the record when the record is initially processed by the system' [col 9, line 56-59].

21. As to claim 8, Norin disclosed 'each globally unique identifier is a 32-bit value' [col 9, line 66-67].

22. As to claim 9, Crozier disclosed 'synchronizing the information records of the target dataset with information records of the source dataset by designating the source dataset as the target dataset, designating the target dataset as the source dataset, and repeating said determining step and said synchronizing step' [col 7, line 56-68].

23. As to claim 10, Crozier disclosed 'synchronization set comprises a delete order specifying particular information records to delete at the target dataset' [table 1, col 9, line 10-11].

Art Unit: 2166

24. As to claim 11, Crozier disclosed 'delete order includes a list of unique identifiers for particular information records to delete at the target dataset' [col 8, line 22-25, col 11, line 32-39, line 44-48]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 65].

25. As to claim 12, Crozier disclosed 'synchronization set comprises an extraction record specifying particular information to add to or modify at the target dataset' [col 7, line 45-54].

26. As to claim 13, Crozier disclosed 'extraction record includes at least one unique identifier together with field information for the particular information to add to or modify at the target dataset' [col 8, line 10-31]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 65].

27. As to claim 14, Crozier disclosed 'excluding certain information records from participating in synchronization by applying a user-defined filter' [col 12, line 39-51, table 3].

28. As to claim 15-16, Crozier disclosed 'user-defined filter comprises an outbound filter applied to information records prior to creation of the synchronization set' [col 14, line 1-6].

Art Unit: 2166

29. As to claim 17, Crozier disclosed 'user-defined filter comprises a user-supplied filtering routine supplying filtering logic' [col 14, line 1-17].

30. As to claim 18-19, Crozier disclosed 'target dataset resides at a remote location relative to the source dataset' [col 15, line 29-34, fig 1].

31. As to claim 20, Norin disclosed 'synchronization set is transmitted to the remote location using an electronic messaging communication protocol' [col 1, line 45-51].

32. As to claim 21, Crozier teaches a system which including 'a synchronization system comprising: means for connecting a first device having a first dataset to a second device having a second dataset [fig 1, Abstract], first device having a first dataset corresponds to handheld computer fig 1, element 101; second device having a second dataset corresponds to fig 1, element 115 because both handheld computer, and desktop computer have database records as detailed in fig 1; synchronization corresponds to Crozier's dynamic reconciliation;

means for determining information of said first and second datasets which requires synchronization' [col 3, line 31-33, col 4, line line 53-57], Crozier specifically teaches dynamic reconciliation between source dataset and target dataset for example as detailed in fig 1-2;

(i) means for determining for each dataset [fig 1-2, element 103, 200] information which has been previously received from the other dataset but which no longer exists at

Art Unit: 2166

the other dataset'[col 5, line 9-17, line 39-42], Crozier specifically teaches mapping of the files between handheld, desktop devices, translation of data between both devices, and transfer of data between two devices as detailed in fig 1, furthermore, Crozier also suggests dynamically reconciling the records and resolving the conflicts between handheld and desktop data as detailed in col 5, line 39-42

(ii) means for determining for each dataset information which has been added or modified at the other dataset since the other dataset was last synchronized with said each dataset [col 11, line 62-67, col 12, line 1-8, fig 7], Crozier specifically suggests if the data in any given field is different, update to the field, or edit part or all of the data in the record and write it to the target database as detailed in col 12, line 1-8;

means, responsive to said determining means, for synchronizing said first and second datasets [fig 1-2, col 3, line 31-37], Crozier specifically teaches dynamically reconciling two database files that corresponds to first and second datasets as detailed in col 3, line 31-33;

wherein said information of said first and second datasets comprises data records [fig 1-2], first and second datasets comprises data records corresponds to fig 2, element 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, and 237, 239, 241, and 243; and wherein said means for determining include means for assigning to each data record a device-independent unique identifier created by the system for uniquely identifying each data record regardless of which dataset and device it appears' [col 8, line 10-38], Crozier specifically

Art Unit: 2166

teaches mapping between handheld, desktop computer records specifying the both handheld, desktop applications, further, Crozier also suggests handheld database file that specifies "record number", i.e., assigning "unique record id " defining the uniqueness of the record as detailed in col 8, line 10-38.

It is however, noted that Crozier does not specifically teach "globally unique identifier", although Crozier specifically teaches record number in source dataset and target data set specifies "unique record ID" [see Crozier: col 8, line 22-25]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier" [col 9, line 64-66].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because both Crozier, and Norin are directed to "synchronizing data sets from source and target, more specifically Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciliation or synchronizing data records between desktop and handheld computer as detailed in fig 1, col 11, 32-39], while Norin also suggests synchronizing and replication of data sets or data objects in a distributing network [see fig 1, col 2, line 44-50, col 8, line 13-26], and both Crozier, Norin specifically teaches "data set or data records is assigned unique ID" [Crozier: col 8, line 22-25; Norin: col 9, line 49-50, line 53-54].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically

Art Unit: 2166

reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because that would have allowed users of Crozier to globally synchronizing clock value as part of the data set ID that identifier uniquely data records across source and target databases, further replication list also containing additional information indicating replication of the data set and a time last modified stamp indicating the time the replica state was last modified as suggested by Norin et al. [col 10, line 22-28] bringing the advantages of highly flexible replication process where time based expiration can be tailored individually for each source and target database [col 6, line 15-16].

33. As to claim 22, Crozier disclosed 'wherein at least one of said devices is a hand-held computing device' [fig 1-2, element 101].

34. As to claim 23, Crozier disclosed 'wherein at least one of said devices is desktop computing device' [fig 1-2, element 115].

35. As to claim 24, Norin disclosed 'means for connecting includes a Transmission Control Protocol/ Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) connection' [col 8, line 60-64].

36. As to claim 25, Crozier disclosed 'synchronizing operates to provide bi-directional synchronization of the datasets' [col 7, line 65-67].

37. As to claim 27, Crozier disclosed 'filter means for selectively blocking synchronization of certain types of information' [col 12, line 39-42].

Art Unit: 2166

38. As to claim 28, Crozier disclosed 'filter means operates based on how old information is' [fig 6, col 8, line 39-42].

39. As to claim 29, Crozier disclosed 'filter means operates based on particular information content' [table 3, col 12, line 20-39].

40. As to claim 30, Norin disclosed 'electronic mail transport means for enabling synchronization of remote datasets' [col 1, line 45-51, col 2, line 44-50].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- | | | |
|----|----------------|---------|
| a. | US Patent. No. | 5701423 |
| b. | US Patent No.. | 5794253 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
August 17, 2006.


SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER